

CHARITON COURIER.

C. P. VANDIVER, Editor and Proprietor.

MAN WAS MADE TO HUSTLE.

TERMS: 1.00 A YEAR IF PAID IN ADVANCE IF NOT PAID IN ADVANCE, \$1.50.

VOLUME XXVI.

KEYTESVILLE, MISSOURI, FRIDAY, JUNE 18, 1897.

NUMBER 21.

We Think We Do.

The Moberly Monitor of June 15th publishes a communication from Elder J. B. Briney of Moberly criticizing our brief criticism of the proposed Ditzler-Briney theological debate and, strongly intimating that we didn't know what we were talking about. If we had had any previous doubt on the subject, the choler the reverend gentleman displays under the "oracular" criticism of the very least of the despised country editors would confirm us in the opinion expressed two weeks ago. From the gentleman's own confession he has a bad case of "theological habit" and is not in a position to consider the subject from an unprejudiced standpoint.

The gentleman misapprehended entirely the scope and purpose of our criticism and of course the illustrations and "arguments" he uses are entirely inappropos. We have no objection to a defense of the Christian religion. That is the right and duty of every member of the church of Christ. A contention over forms and ceremonies or over mere theological questions, not vital to the plan of salvation, is an entirely different matter. The divinity of Jesus Christ, faith in him as the only "name under heaven" given among men, whereby we must be saved, "an acceptance of his perfected work as a complete propitiation for the sins of those who believe and baptism in his name as a signal of our acceptance of his perfected work and as a sign of the washing of our souls in his cleansing blood, but not that by, in or through the act, by any mode, the sins of any human being have ever been or ever will be washed away or remitted. These we regard as some of the essentials for which the Christian everywhere is bound to contend.

It is true that Christ said: "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace but a sword," and not as incorrectly quoted by the gentleman but he no more commends him who uses the sword than he does those by whom he said "offenses must come." It was not Paul, dear elder, who said "earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints" (and not as you attempt to quote it, "content earnestly for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints,") but "Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ and brother of James." Nor was he speaking of baptism in any of its relations nor of the operation of the Holy Spirit, but of the "turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ." We would, in this connection, kindly recommend to our reverend brother that whenever he attempts to quote the word of God he do it correctly according to some authorized version. If he simply means to give what he understands as the sense of the passage, then he should omit the quotation marks. This would be respectful and fair to the

written word. Too many people who do not read the Bible accept these haphazard statements of both preachers and laymen as the very word of God.

Far from these discussions, over peculiar forms and ceremonies and theological interpretations of scripture, causing the masses to study the Bible, they simply confirm minds previously prejudiced in that bias, or, if they search the scriptures at all, they do so with the single purpose of finding texts to clinch (in their own minds) their former beliefs. Each disputant has his partisans and they applaud or dissent as their respective banners rise or fall.

We are willing to admit the justice of the gentleman's criticism on the press. The press is guilty of many things we condemn. Yet we would not curb by one jot or tittle its freedom, but would reform its license. In the presidential campaign last year we were not silent or in the rear ranks in the great political battle that was being fought. We battled, however, for the great principles at issue. We did not waste our ammunition firing at such immaterial things as the comparative merits of the convention over the primary election system for nominating candidates, or that the Democratic two-thirds rule for nominating a national ticket was vitally superior to the republican majority rule.

It is not necessary to imitate the gentleman extolling the value of truth. We might be as devoted to it as the gentleman, and then not feel called on to defend all truth against every challenger. We would not waste a puff of breath or an instant of time arguing to prove to a doubter the rotundity of the earth. We would never be able to convince him, and as he would be in no more danger of falling off whether he believed it to be flat or round, we would simply leave him to die happy in his peculiar belief. Nor would we have the Christian church waste the smallest span of its time from its one duty of saving souls to debate the question of the "mode" of baptism. The church has more important matters demanding its attention. There is no more merit in such a question than in the one whether we stand or kneel during prayer in the public assembly, or even prostrate ourselves prone upon the ground. Both are matters of individual choice, and should be governed by the decision of each branch of the church.

We hope we have sufficiently answered the gentleman.

Dore Rose Escapes.

Theodore or "Dore" Rose, who was confined in jail at Fayette, under ten years sentence to the penitentiary for the killing of Charlie Wells at Glasgow, Nov. 3rd last, pending an appeal of his case to the supreme court, escaped from the jail at there Monday night. The prisoner cut a hole through the brick wall of the jail, but how he got out or came to be outside the iron cage is not stated, and descended to the ground on a blanket. There, friends supplied him with revolvers and a horse. Jim Dougherty, who was confined with him under indictment for murder, refused to make his escape at the same time and when Rose had left gave the alarm to Sheriff Mitchell, who immediately organized a posse and started in pursuit, but so far as we have heard, without success. Rose is said to be a desperate man and it will be dangerous for anyone to attempt to arrest him as they would an ordinary criminal.

The sheriff at once sent descriptions of the escaped prisoner all over the country and offering a reward of \$400 for his apprehension and delivery to the authorities. He is described as follows:

Aged 46 years, 5 feet 7 or 8 inches high, slim build, weight 135 pounds, large brown eyes, slightly crossed, squints one eye when talking, dark complexion, very long, heavy mustache, front teeth decayed, dark hair, thin on top of head, constant smoker of cigarettes, a brick-layer by occupation.

A Remarkable Proceeding.

Jno. A. Burch, sheriff of Knox county, Mo., has strange notions of official amenities, to call some of his recent proceedings in this county by no harsher term.

Mrs. Etta Hereford, nee Castle, C. L. Castle and J. B. Foster, in April, 1894, were living together in Greensburg, a village ten miles north of Edina, Knox county, Mo. Foster had come there from Michigan to collect a debt from the Castle woman. Foster suddenly disappeared and it was given out by the Castles, brother and sister, that he had gone to California. Soon thereafter Miss Castle married Hereford. On the 23rd day of March 1896 the dead body of C. L. Castle was found near LaPlata, Macon county, with letters in his pocket confessing to the killing of Foster two years previous.

This "confession" put the Knox county officials on the hunt for evidence in the case. The Greensburg premises were searched and on the 11th day of June 1897, buried under a woodshed connected therewith, was found a dead body, supposed to be that of the missing Foster. The skull was crushed, and under the body were his clothes and over it a bloody shirt, showing that he had been murdered. Further evidence showed that in all probability others than C. L. Castle had a hand in the tragedy.

Suspicion strongly pointed to the sister, now Mrs. Hereford and living in this (Chariton) county, as either being a consenting or acting party to the killing or of having a guilty knowledge of the same.

The grand jury at once took up the case, as was their duty, and ordered the sheriff of the county to apprehend the woman and bring her before that body. Here is where the strange actions of the sheriff appear.

Mrs. Hereford was living near Guthridge's Mill, a post-office seven or eight miles almost due north of this place (Keytesville) the county seat and the official residence of the sheriff of the county. The general rule and we might say the proper course to be pursued when a sheriff goes into another county to make an arrest is for him to take into his counsel and assistance, either the sheriff of the county or some local constable. This, however, our Knox county sheriff did not do in the present case, nor did he even come to the county seat, the proper, and in the present case the most accessible point to Guthridge's Mill at which to leave the train. Instead he went to Brunswick, 12 miles beyond on the Wabash railroad and more than twice as far from the residence of the woman in whom he was in search. Nor did he there call to his assistance the local constable in making the arrest, but procured a buggy and driver at one of the livery stables of the town. Mark Grizmacher was the driver. And when he had arrived at the home of Mrs. Hereford the sheriff would not, himself, put the woman under arrest, but requested Grizmacher to perform that service for him, giving as an excuse that he was not accustomed to arresting women. Grizmacher, whether on account of his superior experience in such affairs, or on account of his accommodating spirit or for the novelty of aping the airs of a sheriff does not appear, assumed the authority thus unlawfully conferred and made the arrest. The woman was then loaded into the buggy by the two men and all drove to Keytesville, where they arrived about 2 o'clock in the afternoon.

Still the Knox county sheriff refused to communicate with our sheriff or seek the assistance of any local officer in guarding his prisoner until train time. On the contrary he went to the Brown House and after the party had secured dinner, the sheriff took a private room in which he kept the woman locked, with no one present but himself, until the street car left for the train that evening at 9 o'clock. The entire proceeding was a most remarkable performance for a sheriff, and is inexcusable by any demand for secrecy in the case.

Let There Be a Reckoning.

The COURIER does not pretend to know where the fault lies, but we do know that the leniency that is frequently extended to parties who are fined in either justices' courts or in circuit court works a hardship on the tax-payers, and is not in keeping with the purport of the law covering convictions for misdemeanors.

Below we give a list of those who have been fined for various petty offenses against the peace and dignity of the state. Many of these have never liquidated the claims of the state against them, while others have paid their fines and costs, but the amounts have not yet been turned into the county treasurer.

The records in the office of the county clerk show that not a single one of the fines and costs assessed against the following parties have ever been marked "satisfied," although several of them, we know, have been paid. It is high time a reckoning were being had in these matters, not only with the view to replenishing the county treasury by collecting from officers against whom various fines and costs bills are charged, but also for the purpose of seeing that no guilty man escapes the punishment that the law has said should be meted out to him. The following is the list, which we publish to enable those who are wrongfully charged with fines to have the error rectified, as well as to remind officers of their sworn duty in bringing "convicts" to time who have not yet paid up, and are still playing hide and seek with justice:

THE LIST.

State vs. Sam Lessley, fine of \$5 and costs in circuit court in October, 1891; charged against ex-Sheriff O. B. Anderson.

Same vs. R. I. Waugh, fine of \$1 and costs in circuit court in November, 1892; charged against

Same vs. Lazarus Bishop, fine of \$10 and costs in circuit court in April, 1893; charged against ex-Sheriff J. E. Dempsey.

Same vs. Wm. Mildred, fine of \$5 and costs before 'Squire F. M. Lewis in January, 1893; charged to S. N. Loveless, constable.

Same vs. Lewis Jackson, fine of \$1 and costs before 'Squire G. W. Cunningham in July, 1893; charged against J. R. Harrison, constable.

Same vs. D. B. Kellogg, Jr., fine of \$20 and costs in circuit court in October, 1893; charged against ex-Sheriff J. E. Dempsey.

Same vs. James Krigbaum, same fine, in same court, same date and same charge.

Same vs. T. H. Binford, same; same. Same vs. Wm. A. Lessley, same; same.

Same vs. Frank Herring, same; same except as to fine.

Same vs. John Padgett, fine of \$10 and costs in circuit court in April, 1893; same charge.

Same vs. L. B. Courtney, fine of \$5 and costs before 'Squire J. M. DeMoss in January, 1894; charged against F. M. Veatch, constable.

Same vs. James Vassar, fine of \$1 and costs in same court in August 1894; same charge.

Same vs. A. C. Vandiver, fine of \$1 and costs before 'Squire H. A. Wheeler in November, 1894, same charge.

Same vs. Doc Cupp, fine of \$10 and costs in circuit court in January, 1895; charged against ex-Sheriff J. E. Dempsey.

Same vs. Ashley Griffin, fine of \$1 and costs before 'Squire Henry Hayes in March, 1893; charged against J. W. Redd, constable.

Same vs. Dolly Blackwell, same fine in same court in October, 1889; same charge.

Same vs. James Smith, fine of \$1 and costs in same court in September, 1894; same charge.

Same vs. Alfred Fennell, same fine in same court in April, 1890; same charge.

Same vs. Wm. Fennell, same fine in

same court, same date and same charge.

Same vs. Oscar Winn, same fine in same court in December, 1891; charged against Wm. Heiman, constable.

Same vs. Frank Ewing, same; same. Same vs. Grant Hyes, same; same. Same vs. James Walton, same; same.

Same vs. Cecil Wayland, fine of \$100 and costs in circuit court in April, 1895; charged against ex-Sheriff J. E. Dempsey.

Same vs. Jasper Maddox, same fine in same court in July, 1895; same charge.

Same vs. John D. Drew, fine of \$5 and costs in 'Squire C. G. Singleton's court in August, 1895; charged against F. M. Veatch, constable.

Same vs. John C. Kelly, fine of \$5 and costs before 'Squire W. H. Conrad in November, 1890; charged against Lewis Dameron, constable.

Same vs. Clark Harper, fine of \$40 and costs in circuit court in January, 1896; same charge.

Same vs. same, same; same.

Same vs. Andrew Johnson, fine of \$1 and costs before 'Squire C. G. Singleton in March, 1896; charged against F. M. Veatch, constable.

Same vs. A. M. Halley, fine of \$50 and costs in circuit court in April, 1896; charged against ex-Sheriff J. E. Dempsey.

Same vs. Sam Lessley, same fine in same court, same date and same charge.

Same vs. John Shull, fine of \$3 and costs before 'Squire F. M. Lewis in July, 1896; charged against S. N. Loveless, constable.

Same vs. Thos. Pixley, fine of \$100 and costs before 'Squire J. M. DeMoss in November, 1896; charged against F. M. Veatch, constable.

Same vs. Lewis Mills, fine of \$1 and costs before 'Squire T. J. L. Hutcheson in December, 1896; charged against A. B. Cameron, constable.

Same vs. Edgar DeMoss, fine of \$10 and costs in circuit court in October, 1894; charged against ex-Sheriff J. E. Dempsey.

Same vs. Dan'l Dyer, fine of \$1 before 'Squire H. A. Wheeler in December, 1891; charged against F. M. Veatch, constable.

This long list of yet unaccounted costs, so far as the record shows, elicits a lax way of "conducting business" that Prosecuting Attorney Collet has signified his intention of reforming, and we are satisfied he will meet with a cordial support in his efforts therein from all our county officials.

That Hay Ride.

That "hay ride" and two young gentlemen, its chief supporters and directors, and who "have it in for" ye forlorn bachelor reporter, have gotten us into trouble. It has come to our ears through various sources that some of the young ladies who were inveigled into that ride by the aforesaid young gentlemen are mad over some of the things we printed last week concerning the performance. And the worst misfortune of all for us, a certain young lady (not a member of the "hay" party) whose good opinion we regard above the praise or censure of all the balance of the world, has intimated, in no uncertain terms, that she does not approve of what we vainly imagined was but a bit of reproachful factiousness. Now the truth about that item is this—we were at the Sneed hotel corner when the party started and were so attracted by the performance that we followed the merry makers to the northern limits of town, but we had no idea of giving it a write up in the COURIER. (We may as well confess that we board in that part of town and as it was our usual time for going home when the "riders" started in that direction, we must perforce follow them if we would get home). The next day we met those

two young men we have before mentioned and they knowing that we never refuse a challenge, dared us to give them a write up. They knew that they were the persons we had in mind in writing the item. They knew we would never accuse any young lady of lunacy, or charge her with being an escaped bedlamite. They knew that our gallantry would never permit us to find any analogy between a bevy of handsome young ladies and an empty barrel, even if the analogy existed. Perish the thought! Nor could we by any possibility have likened those young ladies to a kicking donkey. We know that young ladies never kick, and therefore, the metaphor would be untrue to nature. We are a crank on the subject of truth and could never have been guilty of the solecism. The fact we suppose is that the performance was so recherche and fetching that it put us in a mesmeric state, in which condition we were an easy prey for the malicious purposes of those two depraved young men. They are the guilty ones. Punish them. We are innocent of intentional wrong and should be acquitted, as we confidently hope, our fair jury will do speedily.

City Council Proceedings.

The city council met again Monday evening in adjourned session. Very little business was transacted beyond receiving and adopting the report of the committee on revision of the ordinances. It was decided to make a complete revision of the ordinances, to the end that whenever the city undertakes a prosecution it may press the same without fear that on appeal the case will be hung up indefinitely or judgment go against the city. The work of revision will be done by J. P. Shaughnessy, city attorney, and Judge O. F. Smith, member of the city council, at the price of \$30 for the completed job. Several old cost bills, inheritances from the last administration, amounting to \$80 or \$90 were audited and ordered paid—whenever the city shall find in its treasury the "where-with" to do so. The new mayor is trying to put the city's affairs on a business basis and we hope he will succeed before the end of his term.

Marriage Licenses.

Jno. P. Sullivan of Marceline and Miss Nellie Othie of this county; W. G. Bernreuther of Ogallala, Neb., and Miss Emma Holderlie of Salisbury; William Hammack and Mrs. Sophrenia Hurt both of Salisbury; Sherman Brantner of Trenton and Mrs. Sallie Morehead of Salisbury.

"NEXT TO MAN"

is his underwear, and our aim this season is to get next to every man in this locality by offering him the best underwear values in this city at any price he desires to pay. We have all prices that others quote, but we think—we know—we offer better qualities than others do,—as proof

Read These Prices:

Cream Colored Honey-Combed Balbriggan at 50c per garment.
Lace Stripe Egyptian Cotton in fancy shades at 50c. See our Straw Hats.

HERBERT WHITE,
Men's Furnisher,
Keytesville, - - Mo.